

to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), this Court need not conduct *de novo* review. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-52 (1985).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 77) in its entirety, and **GRANTS in part and DENIES in part** Defendant Farris's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 52) and **GRANTS in part and DENIES in part** Defendant Hill's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Doc. 54). As a result of this ruling, the following claims remain in this case:

1. That Defendant Farris violated Sykes' Eighth Amendment rights through deliberate indifference to his prostate problems on or about April 1 to April 7, 2009 (the dates referred to in Sykes' June 22, 2009 grievance);
2. That Defendant Hill violated Sykes' Eighth Amendment rights through deliberate indifference to his alleged prostate problems on or about June 24, 2009;
3. That Defendant Hill's failure to address Sykes' concerns about a possible skin rash, a symptom of crabs or MRSA, in February 2009, constitutes deliberate indifference to Sykes' serious medical needs, in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 10th day of February, 2012

s/Michael J. Reagan
MICHAEL J. REAGAN
United States District Judge